DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 316 CG 017 556

AUTHOR Uleman, James S.; Weston, Martha
TITLE Changing Social Roles Changes BSRI Masculinity and Femininity.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association (Baltimore, MD, April 12-15, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Higher Education; *Individual Characteristics; Parent Role; Parents; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Bem Sex Role Inventory; Masculinity Femininity Variable; *Social Roles

ABSTRACT

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) has come under much criticism relating to the interpretation of the masculinity and femininity scales upon which its four sex role types are based. To investigate the masculinity-femininity construct using the BSRI under standard self-description instructions and under self-description instructions in one of two specific sex roles, two studies were conducted. In the first study, 41 pairs of parents of 4- to 9-month-old infants twice completed the BSRI, the Carey Infant Temperament Questionnaire, a survey of infant behavior, and a description of themselves in the mother/father role. In the second study, 79 college students (47 males, 32 females) completed the BSRI and described themselves as a college student and then in the boyfriend/girlfriend, spousal role. An analysis of the results of both studies showed that self-descriptions on the BSRI were not stable across social roles. In 75% of the cases, when subjects described themselves in the roles of mother or father, student, or boyfriend or girlfriend, their scores on masculinity and femininity changed significantly from their descriptions under standard instructions. Both studies also showed that adopting specific sex roles, such as parent or romantic partner, did not increase sex role traditionalism. The findings support a multidimensional conception of sex roles. Future research should focus on the relationship of specific sex role characteristics to global sex role stereotypes. (BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246316

Changing Social Roles Changes BSRI Masculinity and Femininity

James S. Uleman

New York University

and

Martha Weston

Crotona Park CMHC, N.Y.

Presented at Eastern Psychological Association annual convention, Baltimore, Maryland, April, 1984

Running Head: What does the BSRI measure?

CG 017556

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James S. Uleman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Changing Social Roles Changes BSRI Masculinity and Femininity

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; BEM, 1974, 1977) is designed to measure sex role self concept in terms of four mutually exclusive sex role types: androgynous, traditional masculine, traditional feminine, and undifferentiated. These are defined in terms of two relatively independent scales of masculinity and femininity, with androgynous subjects being high on each. This basic conceptual approach has been widely acknowledged as an important advance (e.g., Kaplan and Bean, 1976; Pleck, 1976) over the shortcomings of previous masculinity-femininity research (e.g., Constantinople, 1973), and has been adopted by other investigators and measures (e.g., Spence and Helmreich, 1978; Berzins, Welling and Wetter, 1978). But the measure has also been criticized. Questions have been raised about the BSRI's scoring procedures (Myers and Sugar, 1979), factor structure (Gaudreau, 1977; Pedhazuer and Tetnbaum, 1979), and purported relationship to psychological adjustment (Locksley and Colton, 1979; Stark-Adenec, Graham and Pyke, 1980).

Probably the most fundamental criticism of the BSRI concerns the interpretation of the masculinity and femininity scales upon which the four sex role types are based. The construction of the BSRI is based on the assumption that there are widely held consensual sex role stereotypes of masculinity and of femininity, which people readily report when they are asked for the personality characteristics which are most desirable for men and the women, according to American stereotypes of masculinity and femininity (the instructions used in selecting BSRI items; Bem, 1974). The interpretation of the BSRI assumes that when people describe <u>themselves</u> on it,to the extent that

their responses match the stereotypes, they have adopted these stereotypes as components of their self concepts.

The first assumption was challenged by Clifton, McGrath and Wick (1976). They had subjects describe the typical housewife, bunny, clubwoman, career woman, and woman athlete by checking the applicable adjectives from a list of 153. Only "active" was checked for all five roles, and there was generally little overlap among the roles in descriptors. Though all five are female sex roles, no core of "femininity" was evident. Thus, the global sex role stereotype of femininity is not the same as stereotypes of specific social roles which are restricted to women. This suggest that sex role stereotyping is multidimensional; that there are distinct stereotypes of specific sex-segregated social roles; and that some of these are quite different from the global sex role stereotypes of masculinity and femininity. More recent research by Ashmore (e.g, Ashmore & DelBoca, 1979) and Deaux (1982) further documents the complexity and multidimensionality of sex role stereotypes.

Locksley and Colton (1979) have even argued that the global stereotypes of masculinity and femininity may not actually reflect beliefs about the covariates of gender per se, but instead reflect beliefs about the modal or average characteristics of occupational and family social roles which happen to covary with gender in this society. Thus, "the content of general sex stereotypes may be nothing other than reified personality characteristics associated with ideal representatives of adult, sex segregated social roles" (Locksley & Colton, 1979, p.1021).

Myers and Gonda have directly examined the adequacy of the BSRI as a measure of global masculinity and femininity. They (1982b) asked almost a

thousand subjects to define masculine and feminine, and coded their open-ended responses. Over 86% of the responses were not represented on the BSRI, being instead descriptions of gender, physical appearance, social and biological roles, etc. Of those responses describing "personality or behavioral characteristics", over 58% were not represented on the BSRI. These same investigators (1982a) also had subjects rate BSRI adjectives in terms of their social desirability, both according to other people and themselves. Significant differences were found between these instructions. There were also significant differences between men and women in attributing these adjectives to male and female targets. So even the content of global masculinity and femininity on the BSRI seems to vary with the sex of subject, and according to whether the stereotype is one's own or others'.

Spence and Helmreich (1978, 1980) have offered an alternative explanation of the BSRI scales. They view them, and their own PAQ scales, as measures of socially desirable instrumental traits and expressive traits. While these are sometimes stereotypically associated with masculinity and femininity, respectively, "these trait dimensions have little or no relationship with global self-images of masulinity-femininity, with sex role attitudes, or with sex role preferences or behaviors that do not quite directly call upon instrumental or expressive capacities" (Spence & Helmreich, 1981, p. 367). In fact, Spence (1982) has flatly stated that "global constructs of masculinity and femininity or 'masculinity-femininity', as ordinarily conceived, have no scientific utility" (op. cit., p. 77). Viewing the scales this way leaves their relationships to sex role stereotypes (either global or specific) as a set of open empirical questions.

The two studies reported here attempted to contrast the views of Bem with Spence and Helmreich's by having subjects complete the BSRI under standard self-description instructions, and then under instructions to describe themselves as they are in one or two specific social roles which they know well. Our expectations were that these self-descriptions would differ from each other, and that the content of these differences would favor either Bem's or Spence and Helmreich's views. The specific social roles were chosen with these two alternatives in mind.

In both studies, men and women were asked to describe themselves in sex-segregated social roles: the parent roles of mother and father in study 1, and the romantic partner roles of girl friend and boy friend in study 2. Bem's interpretation of the BSRI scales as masculinity and femininity leads in two ways to predicting that subjects should describe themselves as more traditionally sex typed in these roles. First, these are basic sex roles, in both the biological and cultural sense. Global sex role stereotypes are presumably based upon how people think they and others behave, and/or should behave in such roles. Even if the global stereotypes represent some kind of average across many sex-segregated social roles, these roles of parent and romantic partner should weigh heavily in such an average. Thus, self consciously describing oneself in the role of mother, or girl friend, should make one more feminine (and perhaps less masculine) because these roles are important bases for defining what it means to be feminine.

Secondly, Bem's gender schema theory also suggests that more traditional sex role descriptions should result from considering oneself in these roles. "Sex typed individuals are seen as differing from other individuals not

primarily in how much masculinity or femininity they possess, but in terms of whether or not their self concepts and behaviors are organized on the basis of gender" (Bem, 1981, p. 356). Asking subjects to decribe themselves on the BSRI as they are in a particular sex role should activate gender schemata, and make it more likely that these schemata will organize their self descriptions. Such organization will produce, according to Bem, more traditional self descriptions.

The predictions implied by Spence and Helmreich's interpretation of the BSRI depend upon how each social role's instrumental and expressive requirements is perceived. We predicted a priori that being an infant's parent calls for more expressiveness from both mothers and fathers (affectionate, sensitive, compassionate, warm, tender, etc.). No predictions were made for instrumentality.

There is some indirect support for both of these positions in previous research with parents. Our predictions from Bem's position are supported by results reported by Abrahams, Feldman and Nash (1976). They compared BSRI scores for four groups of 15 couples each: cohabiting, married but childless, expecting, and parents. For both men and women, the largest differences between masculinity and femininity occurred for parents, and they were in the direction consistent with the parents' gender. Abrahams, et al. concluded that becoming a parent increases sex role traditionalism, for men and women.

The Spence and Helmreich predictions have weak support from Russell (1978), who examined the relations between standard BSRI self descriptions and parenting behavior reported by 43 Australian couples recruited at a shopping center. Androgynous fathers spent more time in child rearing activities than masculine fathers, and fathers with high femininity scores (androgynous and

feminine) spent more time than those with low scores. There were no effects for mothers. These results are consistent with the laboratory findings of Bem & Lenny (1976) and Bem, Martyna & Watson (1976). They found that androgynous men were more nurturant toward an unfamiliar five month old infant than masculine men, and not different from androgynous and feminine women.

Study 1

In this first study, we asked parents to fill out the BSRI twice: first simply describing themselves (the standard instructions), and then describing themselves in their role as mother or father. Parenting roles seemed ideal because they are sex segregated by biology, and they are pervasive in society and familiar to everyone, usually through direct experience in childhood and, for our subjects, through direct experience as parents.

Method

Subjects

Forty-one pairs of parents of four to nine-month old infants were recruited for a study of parent-infant interactions (Weston, 1982), through personal contacts and service agencies in the N.Y. Metropolitan area. They were largely professional and upper middle class. Most mothers had interrupted full-time careers for the birth of their children, and planned to resume their careers. All of them were currently at home with their infants full-time. Mothers' ages ranged from 23 to 39, with a median of 29. Fathers' ages ranged from 24 to 56, with a median of 31. Twenty-two of the infants were girls, and 26 were first borns.

Procedure

After being contacted initially by telephone, parents received an introductory letter and three questionnaires by mail. The letter described the study as an investigation of parent-infant interactions, asked them to fill out the questionnaires and return them by mail, and told them that a one-hour home visit would then be scheduled. During that visit, the second author would observe and code each parent playing for about 15 minutes with the baby. The three questionnaires were a BSRI with standard instructions for each parent and the Carey Infant Temperament Questionnaire (Carey & McDevitt, 1978), a 95-item survey of the infant's behavior.

During the home visits one to four weeks later, parents were asked to complete the BSRI again under parental role instructions while the other parent was playing with the infant. Fathers and mothers filled out the questionnaire first about equally often. The parental role instructions read: "On the attached sheet you will be shown a large number of Personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself in your role as MOTHER (FATHER). That is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you as a MOTHER (FATHER) these various characteristics are."

Results and Discussion

Following recommendations by Bem (1977) and Spence & Helmreich (1978), the medians on masculinity and femininity under standard instructions and under role instructions for the full sample (n=82) were used to determine sex role types. The masculinity median was 5.06 under standard instructions and 5.01 under role instructions; the femininity medians were 4.93 and 5.25,

respectively. Table 1 presents the frequencies of each of the four sex role types among mothers and fathers, for standard and parental role instructions.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

In order to test whether the frequency distributions of BSRI sex role types are different under the two instructions, chi squares were calculated for mothers and fathers. The standard instruction frequencies were taken as the expected frequencies, under the null hypothesis of no difference between them. Mothers' chi square (3 df) = 7.33, $p < .10$; fathers' chi square (3 df) = 13.21, $p < .01$. Inspection of Table 1 reveals that parental role instructions primarily increased the number of androgynous mothers. A chi square test for the significance of changes in this vs. other types was significant, chi square (1 df) = 4.17, $p < .05$; no other types showed significant changes themselves. The number of androgynous fathers decreased significantly, chi square (1 df) = 6.13, $p < .02$. There was also a tendency for feminine fathers to increase, chi square (1 df) = 3.20, $p < .10$. No other changes were significant. So there were significant changes in the frequencies of sex role types under parental role instructions, but these changes did not increase the frequencies of traditional sex role types.

Table 2 presents correlated t-tests on masculinity and femininity under both instructions for mothers and fathers. All of the scales changed significantly. Under parental role instructions, mothers became more feminine (5.09 to 5.45, $p < .001$) and more masculine (4.77 to 4.96, $p < .05$), consistent with the increase in androgynous mothers noted above. Fathers also

became more feminine (4.66 to 5.05, $p < .001$) but less masculine (5.32 to 5.07, $p < .02$), both of which are inconsistent with increasing sex role traditionalism in the parental role.

The three possible outcomes were that under sex role instructions, BSRI response would (1) not change, (2) increase sex role traditionalism, and (3) change to more closely reflect the role's expressiveness and instrumentality. Results already presented rule out the first two possiblities. In order to explore the third, t-tests were performed on individual items, parallel to the analyses of scale scores in Table 2. Results for items yielding significant changes are listed in Table 2. They clearly support the third outcome.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The items which changed seemed to reflect the subjects' specific conceptions of the roles of mother and father, in their increased emphasis on nurturance and tenderness, and de-emphasis of competitiveness. The global constructs of masculinity and femininity seem too broad to accurately describe these changes. Describing men in the father role as less masculine and more feminine on the BSRI is true, as far as it goes. But the item analysis indicates that it is more accurate to describe them as less independent and competitive, and more affectionate and nurturant. Similarly, women as mothers are more masculine and more feminine, but more accurately they are more decisive and assertive, and more gentle and nurturant (see Table 2). This is most consistent with Spence and Helmreich's view of the BSRI.

There is an alternative interpretation of these results, in terms of social desirability and impression management. Although the subjects knew from the outset that they would be studied as parents interacting with their infants, it is possible that this was especially salient during the home visit when these observations were made. This may have increased their concern about being seen as adequate or desirable parents, and influenced both their BSRI self description under parental role instructions and their behavior with their infants. Thus, the changes we found in the BSRI could have been the result of impression management, and fit some stereotype of the socially desirable mother or father, rather than being "accurate" self descriptions in those roles.

The study does not provide any data for checking this alternative directly. However, if impression management and socially desirable stereotypes of parenting were major determinants of the second BSRI, they should also have been major determinants of the 15-minute parent-infant play interactions as well, and these two should have shown some correspondence. They did not (Weston, 1982). Parent-infant play was coded according to categories developed by Lamb (1976). There was only one relationship between the standard BSRI and play: feminine fathers engaged in more conventional play than masculine and undifferentiated fathers. And there were no significant relationships between play and the BSRI under parental role instructions. Thus, there was no evidence that impression management, which would have affected both play and the parental role BSRI, increased their correspondence with each other.

Study 2

This study was designed to test the generality of the effects obtained in the first study. Would other sex-segregated social roles produce changes on the BSRI, and would they increase sex role traditionalism? Would other social roles, which are not sex segregated, change BSRI responses in directions Spence and Helmreich might predict? We were also interested in minimizing potential impression management, and in controlling for possible order or practice effects in filling out the BSRI several times. College students describe themselves on the BSRI under standard instructions, and then in their roles as college students and as girlfriends or boyfriends, or in these latter roles in the reverse order.

Bem's view of the BSRI suggests no predictions for the student role, especially at a large university with roughly equal numbers of men and women. The romantic partner roles were expected to increase sex role traditionalism for the two Bemian reasons described above. On the other hand, in terms of Spence and Helmreich's viewpoint the romantic partner roles were *a priori* expected to increase expressiveness and decrease instrumentality, for both sexes. We also expected the student role to have the opposite effect for both sexes, decreasing expressiveness and increasing instrumentality.

Method

47 men and 32 women from introductory and social psychology classes at N.Y.U. participated by filling out a self-explanatory booklet in a "1/2 hour study of self concept". After assurances of confidentiality and anonymity, and without putting their names on the booklets, they filled out the BSRI under standard instructions. Then for approximately half the subjects, the

next page in the booklet instructed them to "describe yourself in your role as a COLLEGE STUDENT. That is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you as a COLLEGE STUDENT these various characteristics are". The last page instructed them to fill out the BSRI in their "role as BOYFRIEND, GIRLFRIEND, or SPOUSE (whichever applies to you)." The other subjects received the student and partner role instructions in the reverse order, after the standard BSRI. This produced a 2(Subject Sex) x 2(Order) x 3(Role = self, student, and partner) factorial design, with the last factor within subjects.

Results and Discussion

Differences in the frequency distributions of BSRI sex role types, under the two role instructions, were tested in the same way as in Experiment 1. Overall results are shown in Table 3. All role instructions had significant effects. Student role instructions decreased androgynous (chi^2, 1 df = 5.93, $p < .02$) and increased masculine (chi^2, 1 df = 2.87, $p < .10$) types among men. Student instructions among women decreased androgynous (chi^2, 1 df = 4.21, $p < .05$) and increased undifferentiated (chi^2, 1 df = 10.02, $p < .01$) types. The boyfriend role increased feminine (chi^2, 1 df = 7.69, $p < .01$) and decreased masculine (chi^2, 1 df = 8.80, $p < .01$) types. And the girlfriend role increased feminine (chi^2, 1 df = 9.45, $p < .01$) and decreased undifferentiated (chi^2, 1 df = 5.64, $p < .02$) types. So as in study 1, the BSRI type frequencies are not stable across role instructions. And changes for men under boyfriend role instructions contradict expectations based on Bem's view of the BSRI.

The 2x2x3 ANOVA on masculinity showed only one significant effect, a main

effect for Role within subjects; Wilks Lambda = 0.9030, approximate $F = 3.77$, $p = .028$. There was no main effect for Subject Sex ($p = .13$) and all other Fs were < 1.0. Self role descriptions were most masculine (4.80), followed by student role (4.69) and boy- or girlfriend roles (4.59). Separate correlated t-tests for each sex, comparing the self role with the others, showed that women's (but not men's) self description was significantly more masculine than their description of themselves in the student and the girlfriend roles (see top of Table 4).

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

The 2x2x3 ANOVA on femininity yielded only two significant effects: a main effect for Subject Sex, $F(1,72) = 4.09$, $p = .047$; and a main effect for Role, Wilks Lambda = 0.5079, approximate $F = 34.40$, $p < .001$. Again, there were no Sex X Role interaction or Order effects. Women scored higher than men across all three roles (4.95 vs. 4.68). And boy- or girlfriend role descriptions were most feminine (5.13), followed by self (4.84) and student (4.47). Correlated t-tests for each sex showed that the difference between self and boy- or girlfriend was significant for women ($p < .001$) but not men ($p = .11$), while the self-student difference was significant for both sexes ($p < .001$; see top of Table 4).

Table 4 also presents the single items on which the self role description differed from the other two, for each sex. In examining these, bear in mind that there was no significant Sex X Role interaction on total scores; men and

women were similar, not dissimilar, in how their role self descriptions differed. On the masculine items, men and women saw themselves as having weaker personalities and less leadership when they were in the student role. And they saw themselves as less independent and competitive in the boy- or girlfriend roles. On the feminine items, self in the student role was characterized by both sexes as less affectionate, flatterable, loyal, compassionate, warm, tender, childlike, and gentle. Students are less expressive. The self in both boy- and girlfriend roles was characterized by both men and women as less shy, and more affectionate, sympathetic, sensitive, compassionate, eager to soothe hurt feelings, warm, tender, and gentle.

These results contradict the hypothesis that adopting sex roles such as boyfriend or girlfriend increases sex role traditionalism. They thus replicate the major results of the first study, with different social roles. Men and women became more feminine and less masculine in the roles of boyfriend or girlfriend, and these roles did not differ from each other. Adopting the student role also had significant effects on BSRI self descriptions, even though it is not a sex role or sex segregated. And there was no evidence of order or practice effects.

General Discussion

Both studies show that self descriptions on the BSRI are not stable across social roles. When subjects described themselves in the roles of mother or father, or student, or boy- or girlfriend, their scores on masculinity and femininity changed significantly from their descriptions under standard instructions in 75% (9/12) of the tests. So self descriptions on the BSRI depend upon the social role one has in mind when completing it. This suggests

that, like so many other personality scales, the BSRI does not measure stable transsituational aspects of personality. It also suggests an important limitation on the standard BSRI's ability to predict behavior in various social roles. If adopting a social role or being in a particular situation changes self descriptions, the standard self description is probably not as good a predictor of behavior in that role or situation as a role- or situation-specific description would be. Of course, this is an empirical question for future research. But role- and situation-specific BSRI self descriptions might increase the instrument's predictive utility.

Both studies also show that adopting specific sex roles, such as parent or romantic partner, does not increase sex role traditionalism. Increased traditionalism might be expected, either on the grounds that global stereotypes are composites of specific sex roles, and parent and romantic partner are among the most important specific sex roles, or on the basis of Bem's gender schema theory, since adopting specific sex roles should make the gender schema more salient. However, this did not occur. In the first study, women became more feminine but also more masculine as mothers, and men became less masculine and more feminine as fathers. In Study 2, women became more feminine and less masculine as girlfriends, but men also changed in that same direction as boyfriends (though men's changes alone were not significant). Half the significant changes on the two scales were in the direction of greater traditionalism, and half were not.

In addition, adopting the role of student (which is unrelated to sex roles either biologically or socially through sex segregation) significantly decreased women's masculinity and decreased men's and women's femininity. How

should that be interpreted? Examination of Table 4 shows that the student role is seen by both sexes as reducing leadership and strong personalities; calling for less affection, loyalty, compassion, warmth, tenderness, and gentleness; and producing less flatterability and childlike behavior. Students must be followers, and relatively cool, distant, and skeptical of others' intentions. Is it more accurate, or conceptually clearer to describe the student role this way, or to say that the student role calls for less masculinity and less femininity? The former is certainly more precise. The latter charaterization is imprecise, but it could be more useful if the BSRI measured sets of traits which consistently covaried, and which comprized the general constructs of global masculinity or femininity. But the present results as well as other results cited above (e.g., Spence and Helmreich, 1980; Myers and Gonda, 1982a, b) challenge these preconditions. Our results show they are not traits with transsituational consistency, even as self descriptions; and they are not related to the sex roles of parent or romantic partner as they should be.

Our results are more consistent with Spence and Helmreich's (1978, 1980) view that the BSRI masculinity and femininity scales are imperfect measures of instrumentality and expressiveness, respectively. Interpreted this way, they indicate that relative to general self descriptions, men see themselves as less instrumental and more expressive in the role of infant's father, and mothers see themselves as more instrumental and expressive. Men and women see themselves in the romantic partner role as less instrumental and more expressive, and in the student role as less instrumental (socially, at least) and less expressive. This reinterpretation of the BSRI scales avoids the

predictions that all sex roles will increase traditionalism, or even change self-descriptions in the same way. And it casts our findings in terms which are more clearly consistent with what we know of these social roles.

The results are also most consistent with a multi-dimensional conception of sex roles (e.g., Ashmore and DelBoca, 1979, Deaux, 1982). Sex segregated social roles call for a variety of different personality traits. Women become more instrumental in their roles as mothers and less instrumental as romantic partners. And though men's instrumentality decreased and their expressiveness increased in both the father and boyfriend roles, other sex-segregated roles such as soldier or bread winner would almost certainly produce changes in the opposite directions. Indeed, asking subjects for descriptions of themselves in well-known roles may be another fruitful way to investigate the multi-dimensionality of sex roles. The relationship of such specific sex role characteristics to global sex role stereotypes, and the relative importance of each in person perception and discrimination, are two important issues for future research.

Author Note

We would like to thank Wayne Winborne, Barbara Fliegelmann, Jodie Pincus and Mark Steinberg for their help in collecting and analysing data, and Diane Ruble for her helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. The views expressed in this paper are the authors' alone.

Requests for reprints should be sent to James S. Uleman, Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, N.Y. 10003.

Table 1

Frequencies of Each BSRI Sex Role Type among Mothers and Fathers under Standard and Parental Role Instructions

Sample and Instructions	BSRI Sex Role Type[a]				
	Undifferentiated	Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Chi square[a]
Mothers					
Standard	7	7	21	7	
Parental	5	7	17	12[b]	7.33*
Fathers					
Standard	11	16	4	10	
Parental	11	19	9	2[b]	13.21***

---

a. Medians were determined separately under Standard instructions, for each sex. Chi square uses Standard frequencies as expected values, df = 3.

b. Significantly deviant from expected values, under Standard instructions, chi squares with 1 df.

*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

Table 2

BSKI items which changed under parental role instructions, by parent and scale (correlated t-tests, df = 40; t positive for increases)

Masculine items	t Values		Feminine items	t Values	
	Mothers	Fathers		Mothers	Fathers
Total	2.03*	-2.53*	Total	5.07***	5.60***
Self-reliant		-2.09*	Yielding	2.82**	2.95**
Independent		-4.26***	Cheerful	4.45***	2.81**
Athletic	2.30*		Shy	-6.36***	-5.54***
Assertive	2.35*		Affectionate	3.95***	5.31***
Strong personality		2.07*	Loyal	2.22*	
Analytical		-2.18*	Sympathetic	3.35**	2.03*
Willing to take risks		-2.83**	Sensitive to the needs of others	2.56*	
Makes decisions easily	2.82**		Understanding	2.64*	
			Compassionate	2.59*	3.97***
Self-sufficient	2.20*		Eager to soothe hurt feelings	3.35**	3.01**
Dominant	2.29*		Soft-spoken	4.01***	3.00**
Aggressive	2.37*	-3.14**	Warm	3.50***	4.87***
Acts as a leader	2.90**		Tender	3.88***	4.35***
Individualistic		-3.95***	Gullible	-2.10*	
Competitive	-3.49***	-3.77***	Childlike		3.98***
Ambitious		-2.52*	Loves children		2.90**
			Gentle	4.76***	3.43***

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 3

Frequencies of Each BSRI Sex Role Type under Standard, Student, and Boy- or Girlfriend Role Instructions

Sample and Instructions	BSRI Sex Role Type [a]				
	Undifferentiated	Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Chi square
Men					
Standard	11	15	9	10	
Student	14	20	7	3[b]	8.73**
Boyfriend	9	5[b]	16[b]	13	11.63***
Women					
Standard	9	4	10	8	
Student	17[b]	5	6	3[b]	12.09***
Girlfriend	3[b]	2	18[b]	8	11.40***

a. Medians were determined under Standard instructions, for each sex, Chi square uses Standard frequencies as expected values, df = 3. Row totals differ because of missing data.
b. Significantly deviant from expected values, under Standard instructions, Chi squares with 1 df.
*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

Table 4

BSRI items which changed under student, and boy- or girlfriend role instructions. (correlated *t*-tests; *t* 0.0 for positive change)

Masculine items	Men(n=45)		Women(n=31)	
	Student	Friend	Student	Friend
Total			-2.11*	-2.04*
Defends own beliefs		-2.37*		
Independent		-2.21*		-2.04*
Athletic			-3.43**	-2.09*
Strong personality	-2.55**		-2.54*	
Analytical	2.71**			
Leadership abilities	-3.83***		-2.33*	
Masculine				-2.06
Acts as a leader	-2.45*		-2.99**	
Individualistic		-2.88**		
Competitive		-5.61***		-3.54***

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

Table 4 (con't.)

Feminine items	Men(n=45)		Women(n=31)	
	Student	Friend	Student	Friend
Total	-5.26***		-6.38***	8.08***
Yielding		3.25**		
Cheerful	-2.45			
Shy		-2.46*	2.14*	-2.33*
Affectionate	-3.60***	4.13***	-5.83***	3.24**
Flatterable	-2.78**		-2.64**	2.53*
Loyal	-2.70**		-3.41**	
Feminine	-2.45*			6.06***
Sympathetic		4.20***	-2.15*	3.41**
Sensitive/others' needs	-2.44*	3.18**		2.72**
Understanding		3.73***	-3.37**	
Compassionate	-2.77**	4.96***	-4.09***	4.23***
Eager to soothe/feelings	-3.31**	3.98***		4.85***
Soft-spoken			2.96**	2.04*
Warm	-2.52*	3.96***	-4.44***	2.48*
Tender	-2.71**	6.16***	-4.25***	6.00***
Gullible			-3.71***	
Childlike	-3.25**		-4.33***	
Loves children	-4.17***			
Gentle	-4.08***	6.01***	-2.06*	4.00***

REFERENCES

Abrahams, B., Feldman, S. & Nash, S. Sex role self-concept and sex role attitudes: Enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations? Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 393-400.

Ashmore, R. D., & DelBoca, F. K. Sex stereotypes and implicit personality theory: Toward a cognitive-social psychological conceptualization. Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 219-248.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Sex-role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S. L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977. 45, 196-205.

Bem, S. L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1047-1054.

Bem, S. L. Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. Psychological Review, 1981, 88, 354-364.

Bem, S. L. & Lenney, E. Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 48-54.

Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Berzins, J., Welling, M. & Wetter, R. A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 126-138.

Block, J.H. Conceptions of sex role: some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.

Carey, W. B. & McDevitt, S. C. Revision of the Infant Temperament Questionnaire. Pediatrics, 1978, 61, 735-739.

Clifton, A., McGrath, D. & Wick, B. Sterotypes of woman: A single category? Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 135-148.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cowen, M., & Stewart, B. A methodological study of sex role stereotypes. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 205-216.

Deaux, K. Sex as a social category: Evidence for gender stereotypes. Invited address presented at the American Psychological Association annual convention, Washington, D. C., 1982.

Garnets, L., & Pleck, J. Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence: A sex role strain analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly. 1979, 3, 270-283.

Gaudreau, P. Factor-analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 299-302.

Kaplan, A. G. & Bean, J. P. Beyond sex-role stereotypes. Boston: Little-Brown & Co., 1976.

Lamb, M. E. Interactions between 8-month-old children and their fathers and mothers. In N. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Locksley, A., & Colten, M. Psychological androgyny: A case of mistaken identity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1017-1031.

Marcus, H. The self in thought and memory. In D. M. Wagner & R. R. Vallacher (Ed.), The self in social psychology. London: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Markus, H., Crane, M., Bernstein, S. & Siladi, M. Self-schemas and gender. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 42, 38-50.

Myers, A. M. & Gonda, G. Empirical validation of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 43, 304-318.

Myers, A. M. & Gonda, G. Utility of the Masculinity-Feminity construct: Comparison of traditional and androgyny approaches. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1982, 43, 514-523.

Myers, A. & Sugar, J. A critical analysis of scoring the BSRI: Implications for conceptualization. JSAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1979, 9, 24 (Ms. No. 1833).

Pedhuzar, E. & Tetenbaum, T. Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 996-1016.

Pleck, J. H. The psychology of sex-roles: Traditional and new views. In L. A. Carter & A. F. Scott (Eds.), Women and men: Changing roles, relationships, and perceptions. N. Y.: Aspen Insitute for Humanistic Studies, 1976.

Russell, G. The father role and its relation to masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Child Development, 1978, 49, 1174-1181.

Spence, J. Traits, roles and the concept of androgyny. In J. Gullahan (Ed.) Psychology and women: In transition. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston, 1979.

Spence, J. T. Comments on Baumrind's "Are androgynous individuals more effective persons and parents?" Child Development, 1982, 53, 76-80.

Spence, J. & Helmreich, R. Masculinity and femininity. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence, J., & Helmreich, R. Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationships with sex role attitudes and behavior. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1980, 5, 147-163.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. T. Androgeny versus gender schema: A comment on Bem's gender schema theory. Psychological Review, 1981, 88, 365-368.

Stark-Adamec. C., Graham, M. & Pyke, S. Androgyny and mental health: The need for a critical evaluation of the theoretical equation. International Journal of Women's Studies, 1980, 3, 490-507.

Weston, Martha, J. The effects of gender, sex role type and temperament on the play behavior of parents and infants. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1982.